



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,989	06/29/2001	Steven Neil Tischer	BELL-0111	1524
38952	7590	11/18/2004		
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			EXAMINER VAUGHN, GREGORY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,989

Applicant(s)

TISCHER, STEVEN NEIL

Examiner

Gregory J. Vaughn

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10/2/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Application History*

1. This action is responsive to the application filing, Application filed on 6/29/2001.
2. Acknowledgment is made to applicant's filing of an Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 10/2/2001.
3. Claims 1-27 are pending in the case, claims 1, 11, 20 and 21 are independent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –*

*(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language."*

Art Unit: 2178

5. Claims 1-3, 11-13, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Krug et al. US Patent 6,721,736, filed 11/15/2000, patented 4/13/2004 (hereinafter Krug).
6. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Krug discloses a method for presenting structured digital content in Figure 5 at reference sign 46 (shown as "Search Results Page"). Krug discloses reading a first file defining a hierarchical structure for presenting digital content items, where the hierarchical structure defines a plurality of categories into which the digital content items are classified. Krug recites: *"FIG. 7 shows the HTML syntax tree provided by the syntax tree parser 20 corresponding to the search result frame 68 of FIG. 6. The syntax tree is the basis for all further procedures. In the preferred embodiments, the syntax tree parser is executed by a module of the interpreter programming language PERL. In the hierarchical syntax tree 76, the HTML tags are arranged in order of their appearance in the documents while their dependence on other tags 70 is represented by their level 78"* (column 10, lines 17-25).

Krug discloses reading a plurality of second files, where the second files defines at least one digital content item to be presented according to the hierarchical structure, and where the second file corresponds to one of the plurality of categories in Figure 2 at reference sign 14 (shown as "Hits").

Krug discloses mapping the plurality of categories to areas on the display in Figure 5 at reference sign 58 (shown as one of the three categories mapped to the page in the figure). Krug discloses receiving a location on the

display and displaying a category of the plurality of categories corresponding to the received location. Krug recites: *"The term "hit" refers to a particular document found by the primary search engine during the Internet search. Usually, the hits retrieved by a primary search engine are embedded in the search response representation among other information. The search result information associated with a hit is grouped together in a "result frame". Hence, a primary search engine usually retrieves several hits during an Internet search, the search response representation comprises a number of result frames with the corresponding hits and additional parts that are not related to a particular search query. In the preferred embodiments, the search responses are encoded in either one of the markup languages HTML or XML. Documents encoded in these languages can be viewed as a sequence of markups (tags) placed within the text defining the format and layout of the text."* (column 4, lines 48-63).

7. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Krug discloses an XML schema file. Krug recites: *"In the preferred embodiments, the search responses are encoded in either one of the markup languages HTML or XML. Documents encoded in these languages can be viewed as a sequence of markups (tags) placed within the text defining the format and layout of the text. In this context, the term "syntax" and accordingly "syntax element" refer to the representation of these markups within the text and their specific meaning. A syntax pattern is a certain sequence of such syntax elements, where the order and the relationship between the syntax elements are important features of the*

*pattern. When displayed with an HTML or XML compatible browser (software tool for displaying Internet documents encoded in HTML or XML), changing one syntax element within an HTML or XML document usually has an effect on the appearance either with respect to the layout or the format of the corresponding part of the text"* (column 4, line 59 to column 5, line 7).

8. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Krug discloses the second file as XML. Krug states that HTML and XML are equivalent. Krug recites: "*In the preferred embodiments, the search responses are encoded in either one of the markup languages HTML or XML*" (column 4, lines 59-61). Krug further recites: "*FIG. 6 shows a sample of HTML source code 68 corresponding to a particular search result frame 58*" (column 10, lines 6-7).
9. **Regarding claims 11-13**, the claims are directed toward a computer-readable medium for the method of claims 1-3, and are rejected using the same rationale.
10. **Regarding claims 20 and 21**, the claims are directed toward a method and a system, respectively, for the method of claim 1, and are rejected using the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*“(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.”*

12. Claims 4-5, 14-15 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krug in view of Wen-Syan Li US Patent 6,691,108, filed 12/12/2000, patented 2/10/2004 (hereinafter Li).

13. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Krug discloses presenting structured digital content items by reading a structure defining file, reading content item files, mapping the content categories to a display, receiving a location on a display and displaying the categories as described above. Krug fails to disclose receiving a selection of a location on a display and identifying a category. Li teaches receiving a selection of a location on a display and identifying a category. Li recites: *“a focused search engine employing the inventive method described herein may provide categorized information; a search may easily be narrowed by selection of a particular category of interest from those categories recognized by the search engine”* (column 2, lines 41-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine receiving a selection of a location on a display and identifying a category as taught by Li with the search engine of Krug in order to *"recognize different classifications of information and identify category-specific search terms which will assist in finding the most relevant documents related to an issued query or other request for information"* (Li, column 2, lines 12-16).

14. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Krug discloses identifying a second file corresponding to a selected category, mapping the second file to a display, receiving a location and identifying a second file related to the received location as described above (see claim 1). Krug fails to disclose displaying the content item corresponding to the identified file. Li teaches displaying the content item. Li recites: "In one embodiment, a focused search engine and method may display query results organized by topic category, as shown on the right side of FIG. 1" (column 4, lines 26-28).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine displaying the content item as taught by Li with the search engine of Krug in order to *"recognize different classifications of information and identify category-specific search terms which will assist in finding the most relevant documents related to an issued query or other request for information"* (Li, column 2, lines 12-16).



Art Unit: 2178

15. **Regarding claims 14-15 and 22-23**, the claims are directed toward a computer-readable medium and a system, respectively, for the method of claims 4-5, and are rejected using the same rationale.
16. Claims 6-9, 16-19 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krug in view of Li, and in further view of Arnold et al. US Patent 6,745,161, filed 7/10/2000, patented 6/1/2004 (hereinafter Arnold).
17. **Regarding dependent claims 6-9**, Krug and Li disclose receiving a selection of a location on a display as described above. Li further discloses receiving a second selection in Figure 6 at the intermediate search results page shown at "car". Krug and Li disclose identifying a second file that corresponds to the selected location as described above. Krug and Li fail to disclose storing an indication of the selected second file (claim 6), storing the indication in the second file (claim 7), storing the indication in a third file (claim 8) or storing the indication in the first file (claim 9). Arnold discloses storing an indication of the selected file in Figure 7, at the bottom of the figure where Arnold recites: *"Identified concepts and related information is embedded in the original source documents or in a proxy documents containing concept tags"*.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the storing of preferences as taught by Arnold with the search engine teachings of Krug and Li in order to provide a *"method that allows a user to easily obtain information via the Web."*

Art Unit: 2178

*The method should allow a user to use natural language, and search based on idea concepts" (Arnold, column 2, lines 38-41).*

18. **Regarding claims 16-19 and 24-27**, the claims are directed toward a computer-readable medium and a system, respectively, for the method of claims 6-9, and are rejected using the same rationale.
19. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krug in view of Arnold.
20. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, Krug discloses presenting structured digital content items by reading a structure defining file, reading content item files, mapping the content categories to a display, receiving a location on a display and displaying the categories as described above. Krug fails to disclose receiving a location selection from a mouse or touch screen. Arnold discloses the use of a mouse and a touch screen. Arnold recites: *"Instead of a mouse or other pointing device, the display can provide a resistive touch surface"* (column 20, lines 24-25).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the use of a mouse as taught by Arnold with the search engine teachings of Krug in order to provide a *"method that allows a user to easily obtain information via the Web. The method should allow a user to use natural language, and search based on idea concepts"* (Arnold, column 2, lines 38-41).

**Conclusion**

21. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

<u>Patent/Publication</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Inventor</u>
• US-6,397,212	05-2002	Biffar, Peter
• US-6,510,406	01-2003	Marchisio, Giovanni B.
• US-6,636,854	10-2003	Dutta et al.
• US-6,647,389	11-2003	Fitch et al.
• US-2002/0073115	06-2002	Davis, Russell T.
• US-2002/0161747	10-2002	Li et al.
• US-2003/0208690	11-2003	Aull, Kenneth W.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory J. Vaughn  
November 9, 2004



**STEPHEN S. HONG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**